On January 4, 1923, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

11194. Adulteration and misbranding of canned shrimp. U. S. v. 899 Cases and 72 Cases of Shrimp. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 16613, 16705. I. S. Nos. 18449-t, 6403-v. S. Nos. C-3690, C-3754.)

On July 10 and August 4, 1922, respectively, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 971 cases of canned shrimp, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by Wm. Gorenflo & Co., Brunswick, Ga., on or about March 19, 1921, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration with respect to a portion thereof, and adulteration and misbranding with respect to the remainder, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. A portion of the article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Crown Brand Fresh Barataria Shrimp 8½ Ounces Packed By Wm. Gorenflo & Co. Biloxi, Miss." The remainder of the said article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Crown Brand Fresh Shrimp * * Packed By Wm. Gorenflo & Co. Main Office Biloxi, Miss."

Adulteration of both lots of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it consisted wholly or in large part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

Misbranding was alleged with respect to a portion of the article for the reason that the statements appearing on the labels of the cans containing the said article, "Barataria Shrimp S½ Ounces," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On January 4 and 5, 1923, respectively, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

11195. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 224 Packages of Chloroform. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destructiom. (F. & D. No. 16644. S. Nos. C-3708, C-3711.)

On July 19, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 224 packages of chloroform, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, New York, N. Y., in part on or about April 20 and in part on or about June 7, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was contained in 1-pound and 7-pound packages labeled in part: "One Pound" (or "Seven Pounds") "Chloroform U. S. P. This product is specially purified for inhalation. Contains 1 per cent. Alcohol New York Quinine and Chemical Works * * * New York City."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was turbid and contained chlorids, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopæia. and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopæia.

On January 4, 1923, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.